REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Applicants amend claims 1, 3-4, 10-12, 17 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Brabander (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0243387) ("De Brabander") in view of Yuschik (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,706) ("Yuschik"). Applicants amend claim 1 to recite generating an initial two-dimensional graphical representation of a call flow and generating a context free grammar representation of the call flow using the initial two-dimensional graphical representation. Applicants submit that the proposed combination of De Brabander and Yuschik does not teach or suggest these limitations.

Applicants first amend claim 1 to recite generating a two-dimensional graphical representation of a call flow which does not alter finite state machines in real time. This amendment introduces two limitations which are not taught in De Brabander. The first limitation not taught in De Brabander is that the graphical representation is a two-dimensional graphical representation. Support for this limitation is found in paragraph [0013] where a graphical editing program such as Visio, which is a two-dimensional graphical editor, can produce the graphical representation. De Brabander does not teach or suggest this limitation and, in fact, teaches directly away from it. De Brabander is directed to three-dimensional visualizations and even teaches away from using a two-dimensional plane because "there isn't enough place for all states, and even worse, transitions between states cross frequently each other, resulting in a chaotic visualization that is difficult to understand visually." De Brabander, paragraph [0004]. De Brabander also includes almost innumerable references indicating three-dimensional

visualizations and implementations. The combination of a heavy focus on three-dimensional implementations and an explicit discouraging statement against two-dimensional planes does not teach or suggest this limitation and in fact teaches away from it. For these reasons, Applicants submit that De Brabander does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1.

The second limitation is that generating the graphical representation does not alter finite state machines in real time. De Brabander does not teach or suggest this limitation and, in fact, teaches directly away from it. De Brabander teaches in the Abstract an "instantaneous evaluation of any fresh change to the grammar ... yielding immediate statistical feedback on parsability." De Brabander further teaches in paragraph [0394] functions that render a three-dimensional scene in real time. Further still, De Brabander teaches in paragraph [0006] a "graphical environment with which the modeller interacts ... to visualise the sub-models in 3D, and interact with them in 3D, so that many more states and transitions can be overviewably visualised. ... [T]he modeller can also choose to see a 3D animation in time ... that allows practically real-time statistical feedback from large representative corpuses after each individual change has been brought to the language sub-models, which in effect leads the modeller to make much better language models." The approach of De Brabander is to allow a user to interact with and edit a three-dimensional model of a finite state machine and see it update in real time. This is a very different approach from what is recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 recites generating a graphical representation that does not alter finite state machines in real time. For example, a call flow designer can generate a graphical representation of a call flow in Visio. That graphical representation is not linked in real time to an actual finite state machine. The graphical representation allows a call flow designer to rapidly prototype and develop an application without breaking the application code or the actual finite state machines used in an automated call flow. For these reasons, Applicants submit that De Brabander does not

teach or suggest the limitation of generating a two-dimensional graphical representation of a call flow that does not alter finite state machines in real time.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims 3-9 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that independent claims 10-12 and 17 recite similar limitations to those found in claim 1 and are likewise patentable along with their independent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP, Account No. 14-1437** for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 18, 2009

By: _____

Thomas M. Isaacson

Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433

Correspondence Address:
Thomas A. Restaino
Reg. No. 33,444
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921